

Remarks

Reconsideration of this Application is respectfully requested.

Upon entry of the foregoing amendment, claims 46-70 are pending in the application, with claims 46 and 64 being the independent claims. Claims 46, 64, 66, and 67 are sought to be amended. These changes are believed to introduce no new matter, and their entry is respectfully requested.

Based on the above amendment and the following remarks, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 46-49, 54-57, 60, and 64-66 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Feiken, et al, U.S. Patent No. 5,870,479 (Feiken). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Feiken does not teach or suggest each and every element of amended independent claims 46 and 64. In Feiken, a "data packet which enters the device 1 is first temporarily stored in the buffer 10. During this time, the header of the packet is copied to the identification unit 14, where the channel (in the case of ATM, the virtual channel or the virtual path) of the data packet is determined." (Feiken, col. 3, line 66 - col. 4, line 3). Using this identification, the control unit "activates the other sections of the device." (Feiken, col. 4, lines 3-7). In Feiken, "the buffer 10 is instructed to release the data packet concerned, while the memory 13 is instructed to place the information belonging to said channel (for example, the key and the status of the

encrypting/decrypting procedure, and optionally the software of a processing) on the bus 15." (Feiken, col. 4, lines 8-14). Thus, as taught in Feiken, the identification unit processes data packet headers in sequence.

Feiken therefore does not teach or suggest "a classification module in the device that determines security association information associated with each data packet in a plurality of data packets associated with a data flow between a source and destination, wherein the classification module is configured to determine the security association information for the plurality of data packets simultaneously," as recited in amended independent claim 46 or "simultaneously determining security association information associated with each data packet in the plurality of data packets in the data flow," as recited in amended independent claim 64.

For at least these reasons, amended independent claims 46 and 64 are patentable over Feiken. Claims 47-49, 54-57, and 60 depend from claim 46 and claims 65 and 66 depend from claim 64. For at least these reasons, and further in view of their own features, claims 47-49, 54-57, 60, 65, and 66 are also patentable over Feiken. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are therefore respectfully requested.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Feiken and Ellis

Claims 50-53, 58, 59, 61, and 62 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Feiken in view of Ellis, U.S. Patent No. 6,484,257 (Ellis). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claims 50-53, 58, 59, 61, and 62 depend from claim 46. Ellis does not overcome all of the deficiencies of Feiken relative to amended independent claim 46. For at least this reason, and further in view of their own features, claims 50-53, 58, 59, 61, and 62 are patentable over the combination of Feiken and Ellis.

Feiken and Leung

Claims 67-70 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Feiken in view of Leung, U.S. Patent No. 6,760,444 (Leung). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claims 67-70 depend from claim 64. Leung does not overcome all of the deficiencies of Feiken relative to amended independent claim 64. For at least this reason, and further in view of their own features, claims 67-70 are patentable over the combination of Feiken and Leung.

Feiken and Ober

Claim 63 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Feiken in view of Ober, et al, U.S. Patent No. 6,708,273 (Ober). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claim 63 depends from claim 46. Ober does not overcome all of the deficiencies of Feiken relative to amended independent claim 46. For at least this reason, and further in view of its own features, claim 63 is patentable over the combination of Feiken and Ober.

Conclusion

All of the stated grounds of objection and rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn. Applicants believe that a full and complete reply has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Amendment and Reply is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

STERNE, KESSLER, GOLDSTEIN & FOX P.L.L.C.



Lori A. Gordon
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 50,633

Date: July 23, 2008

1100 New York Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005-3934
(202) 371-2600

851831_1.DOC